

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/024,057	12/17/2001	Stephen W. Montgomery	884.569US1	5312
21186	7590 05/19/2004		EXAMI	INER
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.			MAYEKAR, KISHOR	
P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1753	
			DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		in the second se				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/024,057	MONTGOMERY ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kishor Mayekar	1753				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replection of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be bly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS for the cause the application to become ABANDO	e timely filed days will be considered timely. rom the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 /	<u> March 2004</u> .					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Thi	is action is non-final.					
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected.		•				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or creation requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on Is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) he held in abevance	See 37 CFR 1 85(a)				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	un priority under 35 H.S.C. & 119	9(a)-(d) or (f)				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documer						
2. Certified copies of the priority documer		cation No.				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri						
application from the International Bure						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies not rece	eived.				
Amazhmant(a)						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summ	nary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Ma					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/19/04.	6) Other:	іаі г аюні Арріюаціон (СТО-132)				

Art Unit: 1753

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after allowance or after an Office action under Ex Parte Quayle, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213 (Comm'r Pat. 1935). Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 19, 2004 has been entered.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 15 is objected to because it is not end with a period. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 1753

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 12, the phrase "the thermal interface material billet" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC \$ 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1753

Claims 1, 2 and 5-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being 6. unpatentable over YANIV et al. (6,312,303) in view of NEUGEBAUER et al. YANIV's invention is directed to a method for aligning particles (5,102,824). within a host phase of a material under an external force. YANIV discloses that the particles are carbon nanotubes (claim 3); the host phase could be a UV curable binder (col. 2, lines 30-33) and the curing of the aligned host phase (col. 3, lines 1-6); the external force is an electric field (claim 13). The difference between YANIV and the above claims is the curing while applying the electric field. NEGEBAUER shows in a method of electrically aligning particles in a host phase the step of curing the aligning host phase while under the influence of the electrical field (claim 5) in addition to the steps of aligning under the electric field and curing without the electric field (claim 3). The subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified YANIV's teachings as shown by NEGEBAUER because NEGEBAUER discloses that the particles are both fix the particles in the host phase by curing with or without the influence of the electric field.

As to the subject matter of claims 2, 10 and 11, YANIV discloses the subject matters in Fig. 7.

Art Unit: 1753

As to the subject matters of claims 12 and 15, the step of adjusting the spacing would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art because the step is necessary in the producing of the final product within a specified specification.

7. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over YANIV '303 in view of NEUGEBAUER '824 as applied to claims 1, 2 and 5-15 above, and further in view of MARRA et al. (5,972,265). The difference between the references as applied above and the instant claims is the use of a conveyor onto which the slurry is dispensed. MARRA shows in a method for producing composites containing particles in a binder the provision of a conveyor onto which a slurry containing particles and binders are dispensed (see Fig. 2). The subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the references' teachings as shown by MAARA because it has been held that it is within the level of ordinary skill to operate a process continuously. In re Dilnot 138 USP{Q 248; In re Korpi 73 USPQ 229; In re Lincoln 53 USPQ 51.

Art Unit: 1753

- 8. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over YANIV '303 in view of MARRA '265 for the same reason as set forth in paragraph #7 above.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kishor Mayekar whose telephone number is (571) 272-1339. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 1753

Kishor Mayekar Primary Examiner Art Unit 1753